MARC HUSEMANN ET AL. USSN 09/778,165 Amendment Dated August 4, 2003 Reply to Office Action Dated February 4, 2003

## CONDITIONAL PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME

If entry and consideration of the amendments above requires an extension of time,

Applicants respectfully request that this be considered a petition therefor. The Commissioner is
authorized to charge any fee(s) due in this connection to Deposit Account No. 14-1263.

## ADDITIONAL FEE

Please charge any insufficiency of fees, or credit any excess, to Deposit Account No. 14-1263.

## **REMARKS**

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of this application in view of the amendments above and the following comments.

Claims 1-8, 11 and 12 were rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. The Examiner maintains her objection to the word "obtainable." In response,

Applicants have amended the claims to change "obtainable" to "obtained."

Also, Applicants have amended claim 1 to correct the obvious typographical error in the first reference to R<sup>2</sup>. Since the monomers are acrylates or methacrylates, it would have been

MARC HUSEMANN ET AL.
USSN 09/778,165
Amendment Dated August 4, 2003
Reply to Office Action Dated February 4, 2003

obvious to any one skilled in the art that the first R<sup>2</sup> was meant to be R<sup>1</sup>. Applicants do not believe this correction introduces new matter.

BRISCOE

Claims 1, 2, 11 and 12 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Massow et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,194,455.

Claims 1, 2, 11 and 12 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by Ushirogouchi et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,045,968.

Claims 1, 2, 11 and 12 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Skinner et al., U.S. Patent No. 4,128,600.

Claims 1, 2, 11 and 12 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Karim et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,721,289.

Claims 1, 2, 11 and 12 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Wesp, U.S. Patent No. 3,765,972.

Claims 1, 2, 11 and 12 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being obvious over Wesp.

In response to *all* of the rejections under 35 USC §§ 102 and 103, Applicants point out that the Examiner indicates in the middle of page 3 of the Office Action that the rejections are based on the claim 1 language "obtainable." Applicants point out that the claim 1 language has been changed to "obtained." Therefore, Applicants believe these rejections are overcome. An

MARC HUSEMANN ET AL. USSN 09/778,165

PAGE 07

early notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Amendment Dated August 4, 2003
Reply to Office Action Dated February 4, 2003
Otice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Applicants believe that the foregoing constitutes a bona fide response to all outstanding objections and rejections.

Applicants also believe that this application is in condition for immediate allowance. However, should any issue(s) of a minor nature remain, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned at telephone number (212) 808-0700 so that the issue(s) might be promptly resolved.

Early and favorable action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

NORRIS MCLAUGHLIN & MARCUS, P.A.

220 East 42<sup>nd</sup> Street 30th Floor New York, New York 10017 Phone: (212) 808-0700

Fax: (212) 808-0844

MARC HUSEMANN ET AL. USSN 09/778,165 Amendment Dated August 4, 2003 Reply to Office Action Dated February 4, 2003

I hereby certify that the foregoing Amendment under 37 CFR \$ 1/11 and the accompanying Petition for Extension of Time (10 pages total) are being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office on the date indicated below:

Date: August 4, 2003

By: Kurt G. Briscoe